



WEB COPY



W.P.No.1283 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.04.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE **MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY**

W.P.No.1283 of 2022
and
W.M.P.No.1389 of 2022

T.S.Narayana Raju

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Managing Director,
Tasmac Limited,
Egmore,
Chennai – 600 008.

... Respondent

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to consider the petitioner for the post of Junior Assistant under through Re-Deployment based upon the petitioner's representation dated 04.05.2021.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Manimaran

For Respondent : Mr.Sathish Kumar



W.P.No.1283 of 2022

WEB COPY

ORDER

The writ petition filed for a direction to the respondent to consider the case of the petitioner for the post of Junior Assistant under the Re-deployment scheme, based upon the petitioner's representation dated 04.05.2021.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner would make a submission that when there is a scheme in place, the petitioner had made a representation and it is for the respondent to consider the case of the petitioner and therefore direction be issued.

3. Per contra, Mr.Sathish Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent would submit that the petitioner as earlier filed W.P.No.9988 of 2020, in respect of the very same relief. Since he scored lesser mark than the cut off mark, the writ petition was dismissed and therefore he is not entitled to.

4. I have considered the rival submission made on either side and perused the materials available on record.



W.P.No.1283 of 2022

5. The prayer of the petitioner is not for any regular cadre posts to which he is not normally eligible. He claims under the re-deployment scheme. While so, under the said scheme, instead of appointing hands from open market, the respondent has conducted an examination among the employees of the respondent itself and as per the results of the examination they have redeployed them as Junior Assistant. The petitioner had also participated in the said selection, however, the cut off mark was 60% for the MBC community to which the petitioner belongs. The petitioner scored only 57%. Therefore, the petitioner was not redeployed and continued in the same post itself.

6. Challenging the same, the petitioner had earlier filed W.P.No.9982 of 2020 which was also dismissed by this Court by its order dated 30.07.2020.

7. In view thereof, the petitioner cannot make a subsequent representation and this Court cannot also direct such representation to be again considered. When the rights of the parties have already been decided in the earlier writ petition, the very same prayer cannot be made in different



W.P.No.1283 of 2022

forms.

WEB COPY

8. Therefore, finding no merits in this writ petition. This writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected writ miscellaneous petition is closed.

10.04.2024

Index : Yes
Speaking Order: Yes
Neutral Citation : No

jas

To

The Managing Director,
Tasmac Limited,
Egmore,
Chennai – 600 008.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.1283 of 2022

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

jas

W.P.No.1283 of 2022

and

W.M.P.No.1389 of 2022

10.04.2024